2. Executive Summary

2.1 Project Environmental Summary

Table 1 provides the reader at a glance with an understanding of the project impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance of impacts after mitigation. Since this is a summary, the reader must look to the body of the EIR for detailed discussion of issues and impacts.

2.2 Project Alternatives

Project alternatives, presented in Chapter 7, have been designed to alleviate identified environmental problems, or were specifically requested for consideration by the public during the preparation of the EIR. Each of the alternatives has been measured against the project objectives. These alternatives focus on approaches capable of eliminating significant environmental impacts, or reducing them to a level of insignificance. The range of alternatives considered is much broader than is required under CEQA, in order to increase public awareness regarding the efforts the County has made to locate jail expansions and to diminish the need for jail beds.

2.3 Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. This summary has been provided in Table 1 of this EIR. Sections 15123(b)(2) and (3) also require that the EIR summary identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, issues raised by agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts.

Areas of public controversy and issues to be resolved which are known or which have been called to the attention of the County during the Initial Study process and scoping meeting are noted below. Because each issue to be resolved involves some degree of controversy, the distinction between the area of controversy and an issue to be resolved is not critical.

- a. The size of the jail facility at the Musick Jail site.
- b. The character of inmate classifications proposed at the Musick Jail.
- c. The security of the jail facility and surrounding area.
- d. Whether changed circumstances exist with respect to the demand for jail beds and supply of same.



- e. Whether there is an adverse effect on property values as a result of the jail expansion, and whether this result will cause a physical environmental impact.
- f. Whether there is a physical, significant adverse effect on the deterioration of the surrounding area as a result of the jail expansion.
- g. Whether bus transportation of inmates is secure.
- h. Whether a jail expansion is needed and/or should be located in this area.
- i. Whether other locations are feasible for a jail.

It is recognized that other issues may be raised during the review and hearing process which were not and could not have been known at the time of the publication of the Draft EIR. Furthermore, issues which have been previously settled through prior environmental impact reports and proceedings will be specifically identified in the EIR. While these issues will not be ignored in the EIR simply because they were settled at an earlier time, the scope of inquiry will only extend to any additional considerations brought on by the expansion project which would have a bearing on the former resolution of those issues. Where certain mitigation measures are within the control of agencies other than the County of Orange, the Sheriff-Coroner, the EIR will use best efforts to disclose the mitigation believed likely to be acceptable to these agencies.

With particular respect to the Orange County Sheriff-Coroner, the Sheriff-Coroner's office has directly participated in the technical support for the EIR as a Responsible Agency. The Sheriff-Coroner has consented to mitigation presented in this EIR.

It is understood that substantial controversy always surrounds the siting or expansion of a jail. It is further recognized that certain of the issues raised in the controversy—regardless of the degree of public interest in them— are not areas of inquiry under CEQA because of that law's unique attention to the environment. Therefore, this EIR will not— and should not— constitute all of the information that decision makers will consider with respect to a decision on this proposal. Where possible and when related to environmental effects, however, this EIR does strive to provide the reader with background information of a non-environmental character to assist in considering the environmental analysis herein and placing it in context.

1.54

Table 1

Executive Summary Matrix

Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures Added?	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Will an Atternative Reduce the Impact in a Manner Equal to or Better than the Mitigation? ²
Landform, Soils and Geology			
None. However, there could be a loss of approximately 33 acres of prime farmland as a result of the location of jail buildings. This is considered offset by the acreage provided for in the Local Redevelopment Agency conveyance. To the extent that the cumulative total of agricultural land between the Musick Jail and the Reuse Plan is reduced, this effect was considered by the Reuse Plan EIR. Additionally - and more importantly - this impact was already considered in the 1986 Musick EIR.	Yes. #1	Insignificant	Yes
Air Quality			
A minor impact to air quality will occur as a result of exceeding the threshold criteria in the Air Quality Management District EIR Handbook.	Yes. #s 2 - 29	Insignificant	Yes
Hydrology			
None. Incremental increases in urban runoff pollutants will occur.	Yes. #30	Insignificant	No
Aesthetics			
Increased view of buildings from Alton Parkway is extended and Irvine Boulevard.	Yes. #s 31, 32, and 33	Insignificant	No
Noise			
None.	Yes. #s 34 - 39	Insignificant	No

Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures Added?"	Level of Signiffcance After Mitigation	Will an Alternative Reduce the Impact in a Manner Equal to or Better than the Mitigation?
Biological Resources			
Loss of riparian area in Borrego Wash, and small exotics area in southwestern corner of the site.	Yes. #40 However, the FCPP EIR has already considered the loss of the Borrego Canyon Wash wetlands.	Insignificant	No
Light and Glare			
None,	Yes. #41	Insignificant	No
Land Use and Wederant Planning			
None. To the extent that adjacent cities are concerned about the stimulus for undesirable land uses, this can be controlled through zonials	Yes. #s 42, 43, and 44	Insignificant	Yes
Public Safety			
None.	No	Insignificant	No
Transportation, Circulation and Parking			
For interim year impacts, Alton Parkway between Jeronimo and Muirlands, and Alton Parkway between Muirlands and the I-5 are considered impacted. For long range impacts, Alton Parkway between Jeronimo and Muirlands, and Alton Parkway between Rockfield to the I-5 are considered impacted.	Yes. #s 45 - 50	Insignificant	Yes
Public Services and Facilities			
The City of Lake Forest has indicated that an increase in patrol personnel will be necessary. It is suggested that one sergeant and five patrol officers be added. The Irvine Unified School District has indicated potential for adverse impacts; however, as indicated in this EIR's discussion, this conclusion is not concurred in by the County.	Yes. #51	Insignificant	No.

Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures Added?"	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Will an Alternative Reduce the Impact in a Manner Equal to or Better than the Mitigation? ²
Socioeconomic Effects			
None.	No	Insignificant	No
Project Construction Effects			
Short term construction noise.	No. However, the County noise ordinance applies to jail construction and limits the hours of operation.	Insignificant	No
Hazardous Materials Assessment			
Yes. Minor environmental concerns have been identified on the site which do not interfere with the development of the site and are normal in any urbanized area.	Yes. #52	Insignificant	No

¹Please consult each topical section or Section 11, "Inventory of Mitigation Measures," for the precise wording of the mitigation measures. The numbers shown are the numbers of the mitigation measures. ²Where possible and feasible, an alternative may be proposed to resolve the impact. The central question is whether the alternative is as effective as, or more effective than, the mitigation measure. This excludes the "No Project" alternative.